

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments to the Specification

The amendment to the paragraph beginning at page 1, line 2, removes the priority claim to U.S. Serial No. 09/848,012 filed May 3, 2001 and provisional application Serial No. U.S. 60/201,725 filed May 4, 2000. These priority claims are being removed as there are no common inventors between the parent application (Serial No. 10/146,934) of the present application and the two applications noted above. A Supplemental Application Data Sheet is also being submitted with those priority claims removed.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 13 and 20 are amended. Claims 14 to 19 are cancelled. New claims 21 and 22 are added. Claims 1, 3-13 and 20-22 are currently pending. New claim 21 is supported by, for example, Figures 5 and 12. New claim 22 is supported by for example, Figure 1 and page 7, line 26 to page 8, line 7 of the application as filed. The Applicants submit that new matter is added by these amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

Claim 20 was rejected because the word "tank" in claim 20 had no antecedent precedent. Claim 20 has been revised to introduce a tank holding a liquid being treated in part (b) of the claim, the liquid having already been introduced in the preamble. Claim 20 was also rejected regarding the term "oriented as in use". Claim 20 has been emended to state that the frame has the elements of part (b) while oriented in a selected orientation and also has the elements of part (c) while in the selected orientation. These amendments clarify that the elements may move horizontally while the frame is oriented as when the frame is immersed in a tank holding a liquid being treated, in which configuration water may flow vertically through the frame. The Applicants submit that the amended claim is not indefinite.

Appl. No. 10/790,239
Amdt. Dated December 7, 2004
Reply to Office action of September 9, 2004

Claim Rejections – Double Patenting

Claims 1-14 and 16-19 were provisionally rejected under 35 USC 101, in relation to 10/146,934. Claim 1 has been amended and claims 2 and 14-19 have been cancelled. Since claims 3 to 12 depend on claim 1, their scope is changed by this dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that the 35 USC 101 rejection no longer applies.

Claims 15 and 20 were rejected for obviousness-type double patenting in view of Application No. 10/146,934. Claim 15 has been cancelled. A terminal disclaimer is being filed with this amendment to obviate the rejection in relation to claim 20.

For the reasons above, the Applicants submit that the claims are allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

COTE et al.

By Scott Pundsack
Scott Pundsack
Reg. No. 47,330
Tel: 416-957-1698